

saw that was wrong and got in there to fix the problem. He made it a priority and he cleaned it up.

He earned the title of Governor with a quick wit, a sharp political eye, and a gift for speaking. Louie could tell these fantastic stories and everyone would love them, captured by his words.

I have always admired his love of politics and that he always stayed committed to the Republican Party. I know he was proud to see the Republican Party win back the governorship, ending the 32-year drought since he held office in 1971. But I remember Louie for supporting his party in Kentucky through its successes and through its failures. Even when there was no one around to join him, he carried the Republican banner proudly.

And through his perseverance, he left a lasting legacy in Kentucky politics. More than any other person, he taught the people in Kentucky how to win elections and with that, he taught Republicans how to win statewide. He used to tell the story about his father, who was a precinct captain in Kentucky. Every election, his father would work as hard as he could and talk with voters one by one. And every election, they would win his precinct. Louie taught us that is how you won an election, one precinct at a time.

Gov. Louie Nunn was respected by his friends and colleagues on both sides of the aisle. All in the Commonwealth of Kentucky will miss him.

FREE TRADE AGREEMENT STRATEGY SHOULD PRIORITIZE JOBS

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about our international trade policy—specifically this administration's selection of free trade agreements.

A year-and-a-half ago, many of us stood on this floor arguing that we should grant the President trade negotiating authority, or fast track. We did so because we believe that good trade agreements can create jobs for American workers and farmers.

I still believe that. And I believe we must move ahead with an aggressive trade agenda—even in an election year.

So what does that mean? Of course, our first priorities should be moving ahead with negotiations in the World Trade Organization and completing the Free Trade Area of the Americas. Those agreements provide—by far—the best opportunities for American workers and farmers.

Unfortunately, both of those agreements are languishing. WTO negotiations broke down last fall in Cancun. And the FTAA has been watered down so much that many are starting to question its value.

The administration, rightly, has chosen not to put all of its eggs in one basket. They have, over the last several years, initiated a number of new free trade agreements.

Now generally, I support this approach. We cannot allow the intran-

sistence of some countries to hold us back from seeking new markets.

But the process by which we select new FTAs is deeply flawed. Initially, there was no process at all. There was no consultation with Congress, no public process, no criteria. To be fair, there's been some improvement—but not much, and only after serious criticism from Congress and the business community.

Mr. President, as a way to try to understand the administration's trade policy, Congressman CAL DOOLEY and I asked the General Accounting Office to assess the criteria and processes that drive the selection of our free trade agreement partners.

Today, GAO is releasing their report, and its findings confirm a number of serious concerns.

First, the criteria themselves are so broad I question whether they are meaningful. GAO finds that the criteria used within the administration to justify the selection of FTA partners have been a moving target. Different sets of criteria were used, for example, when deciding to go forward with the Central American and Australian FTAs than were used for some of the most recently announced FTAs, such as Thailand, the Andeans, and Panama.

Whatever the criteria considered, they are not weighted by importance. Moreover, the criteria are so broad—and their consideration so open-ended—it is hard to imagine any country in the world that couldn't meet them.

Second, to the extent that the existing criteria and review process set priorities, I question whether they are the right ones. GAO finds that strategic and foreign policy goals dominate the FTA selection process.

In my view, this takes our trade policy down the wrong path. I have long believed that trade agreements should be pursued on their own merits—because they create commercial opportunities for our farmers and businesses, and most critically, because they hold out the prospect of more and better-paying jobs for American workers.

These paramount concerns seem largely lost in the selection process, which looks like more of a throw-back to the Cold War—when trade policy was treated primarily as an instrument of foreign policy.

Third, the entire selection process is woefully lacking in transparency and public participation. GAO finds that, at the time this report was requested, there was virtually no formal process at all for selecting FTAs.

The attention focused on this situation by this investigation has clearly contributed to the development of a more formal interagency process for considering potential FTAs. But the process is still a closed one.

There is no notice of countries under consideration for future FTAs until the choice has already been made. There is no formal process for soliciting the views of Congress, the business commu-

nity, or the general public. There is no formal public discussion of how to prioritize negotiating resources.

To my surprise, in fact, the administration has insisted until recently that the selection criteria themselves are classified. Important trade policy decisions like these should not be made in secret based on secret criteria.

Mr. President, at a time when manufacturing and other jobs are increasingly moving offshore, we need a trade policy that helps U.S. companies create and keep good jobs in this country. We need to bring the focus of our trade agenda back to commercial benefits and, most importantly, to jobs. We need to have a public dialogue on how choices are made and how resources are allocated. I urge the administration to engage with Congress to address the issues raised by this report.

I yield the floor.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNITION OF ANNIE LEE COONEY ON HER 100TH BIRTHDAY

• Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I rise today with the distinct privilege of recognizing one of St. Louis's most outstanding citizens, Mrs. Annie Lee Cooney on the occasion of her 100th birthday February 25, 2004.

Mrs. Cooney was born in Indianola, MS, as the third youngest of seven girls and two brothers. As the granddaughter of slaves and the daughter of active participants in the African-American community, Annie Lee was instilled at an early age with values and character that remain strong to this day. Her parents, Indiana and Oliver Jarman were active in the African-American community in her hometown. Her father, Oliver Jarman, was a high ranking official in the Prince Hall Masons in Mississippi and was also instrumental in founding a Penny Bank in Greenville, MS.

In 1922, after attending the Tuskegee Institute, in Tuskegee, AL, Annie Lee moved to St. Louis to live with her sister and helped with her new baby. But it was in St. Louis where Annie Lee's life changed when she met and fell in love with Roy Cooney. The young couple were married in 1924 and Roy and Annie Lee Cooney soon became the loving parents to thirteen children—seven girls and six boys, all of whom went on to attend college.

Mrs. Cooney has been very active in the Black Catholic Community in St. Louis since the early 1930s. Some of Mrs. Cooney's professional achievements include being named President of the Sisters of the Blessed Sacrament alumni in the 1960s and Sigma Gamma Rho Sorority Mother of the Year in 1980. Mrs. Cooney has been an active member of the National Council of Negro Women, the Council of Catholic Women, the Legion of Mary, the Catholic Knights of America, the Cairo Social Club, charitable works and scholarships to Black youth, and the Seminarians Club, spiritual and financial